1	2	3
12.	Pillerans	500
13.	Mattress	156
14.	CGI Sheets	1788 MTs.
15.	Clothes	8 cartons
16.	Towels	300
17.	Refined Oil	10440 Ltrs.
18.	Water	2880 Ltrs.
19.	Salt	12 Qtls.
20.	Pipes	400

Indian sentenced in Saudi Arabia

3256. SHRI A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that Indian nationals are facing various charges and sentences in Saudi Arabia as on today;

(b) if so, whether it is a fact that Indian National from Kerala are facing the sentence of "left eye to be scooped out";

(c) if so, the details including the steps taken to save the citizen from the above sentence, if any; and

(d) the number of Indian nationals in the jails of Saudi Arabia and action taken to examine their cases?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI E. AHAMMED): (a) Yes.

(b) According to media reports, Mr. Abdul Lateef Naushad, an Indian national has been sentenced by a Saudi Court that his eye should be removed due to an incident involving him and a Saudi citizen in which the latter lost his eyesight.

(c) Details of the case, as per media reports and a petition received from Mr. Naushad's wife, are that on 1 April 2003, a Saudi national, Mr. Naif Al-Otaibi, came to buy a battery charger from the Delta Petrol Station

in Dammam, Saudi Arabia, where Mr. Naushad was working. There was an argument between the two over the purchase of the battery charger and in the scuffle that followed, the Saudi national's eye got injured. Doctors who examined the injured eye subsequently reported that he had lost his eyesight. Naushad was arrested and in the judgement after investigations the Dammam Court issued a verdict that his eye should be taken out as demanded by the Saudi victim as a *quid pro quo* for losing his eye.

On 5 December 2005, the Ambassador of Indian to Saudi Arabia sent a Mercy Petition to the highest authority, His Majesty King Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud of Saudi Arabia requesting him for grant of Royal Pardon. Ambassador also sent separate Mercy Petitions to the Governor of Dammam (where the incident took place and where the Indian is imprisoned now) as well as the Governor of Riyadh (as the case may finally be decided in the High Court in Riyadh). An Embassy representative was rushed to Dammam jail on 8 December 2005 where the jail authorities confirmed the imprisonment of Mr. Naushad. A formal request for consular access has also been submitted to the local authorities. The Saudi Ambassador in Delhi was also invited on 8 December 2005 to the Ministry of External Affairs and requested to use his good offices to help resolve the problem.

(d) As per intimation received from the Government of Saudi Arabia, 1444 Indian nationals were imprisoned in 2004 and this year (as on 9 Dec. 2005), 1104 Indians have been imprisoned.

Even though intervention by diplomatic missions in cases under investigation is not allowed in Saudi Arabia, our Mission approaches the Saudi Ministry of Foreign Affairs for arranging consular access as soon as intimation about imprisonment of any Indian national is received. In addition, during the holy month of Ramadan, the Mission also sends formal requests for Royal Pardon for release of Indian prisoners on humanitarian grounds. The number of Indian prisoners granted Royal pardon, except in case of capital punishment, in the last few years are given as follows:

1999-2000	535
2000	359
2001	563
2002	585
2003-04	392

In cases of payment of blood money, when poverty is proved, the Mission submits Mercy Petitions for release of the concerned detainees. In cases where the Mission comes to know of any Indian citizen who has been awarded the death sentence, the Mission approaches the Saudi authorities at the highest level with Mercy Petitions for their release or for a lesser punishment.

Extradition treaties with SAARC countries

3257. SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that extradition treaties between India and all the other SAARC member countries are existing;

(b) if so, the details thereof, including the dates of signing of such treaties with the respective countries;

(c) if not, the details of countries with who extradition treaties could not yet be entered into;

(d) the reasons therefor in respective cases; and

(e) the details of efforts made/being made to enter into extradition treaties with those SAARC member countries with whom no treaty exists?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI E. AHAMMED): (a) and (b) The Government of India has signed Extradition Treaties with two SAARC member countries *viz.* Nepal and Bhutan. There also exists an Extradition Arrangement short of a treaty with Sri Lanka. India signed an Extradition Treaty with Nepal in 1953, which came into force in 1963. The Extradition Arrangement with Sri Lanka became operative from September 1978. The Extradition Agreement with Bhutan was singed in 1996.

(c) and (d) There is no Extradition Treaty with Bangladesh, Maladives and Pakistan. The conclusion of an Extradition Treaty is a bilateral process, where both the signing States have to indicate their willingness in negotiating and signing such a Treaty.

(e) It has been the constant endeavour of the Government of India to conclude Extradition Treaties with as many countries as possible. The Government has been taking up this matter the concerned Governments from time to time.